

Town Meeting

Illinois U Library



Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR



Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

How Can We Make a Defense Pact With Western Europe?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

ESTES KEFAUVER

R. W. G. MACKAY

BOURKE K. HICKENLOOPER

QUINCY HOWE

(See also page 12)

COMING

—February 15, 1949—

Is There Any Defense Against Atomic Warfare?

—February 22, 1949—

Should We Adopt a Compulsory National
Health Insurance Program?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF FEBRUARY 1:

"How Can We Make a Defense Pact With Western Europe?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Senator HICKENLOOPER	4
Senator KEFAUVER	6
Mr. HOWE	8
Mr. MACKAY	9
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	17



THE BROADCAST OF FEBRUARY 8:

"Do We Need a New Approach to Peace?"



THE BROADCAST OF FEBRUARY 15:

"Is There Any Defense Against Atomic Warfare?"



The Broadcast-Telecast of February 1, 1949, originated in Town Hall, New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Co. Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting



GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR



FEBRUARY 1, 1949

VOL. 14, No. 40

How Can We Make a Defense Pact With Western Europe?

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. First, let me thank you for your magnificent response to last week's program. Never before in our history have we presented a Town Meeting on education that has drawn such an overwhelming response. Our entire staff has been busy all week reading your very interesting letters, so if we're a bit late with our replies, please know that we are most appreciative of your generous response.

Tonight, we're about to begin what is likely to be another great debate on American foreign policy. In view of the tactics of Soviet Russia in weakening the effectiveness of the United Nations as an instrument for peace, most of the nations outside the Iron Curtain are seeking to find more effective ways of securing themselves against the possibility of Soviet aggression.

The nations of the Western Hemisphere, meeting in Rio de

Janeiro in 1947, entered into an agreement which went into effect December 3 of last year and which provides for collective action by the American Republics in the event of an armed attack against a western nation, whether from within or without the Americas.

Last March, shortly after the fall of Czechoslovakia, the governments of the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg met in Brussels and entered into a similar agreement involving sweeping plans for closer economic, social, and political cooperation.

Last June, the Republican-controlled 80th Congress of the United States adopted what is known as the Vandenberg Resolution, affirming, among other things, that this Government, by constitutional processes within the United Nations Charter, should enter into such regional and other collective arrangements as are

based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid.

Although our present Congress and Administration are not necessarily bound by this resolution, it's definitely understood that our Government has been exploring effective and constitutional methods of entering into a formal military defense alliance with Canada and the nations of Western Europe.

Last Saturday, the five nations that signed the Brussels pact announced the formation of a Council of Europe, which is considered by many to be the first step toward the establishment of the United States of Europe.

On the same day, the Soviet Union issued a 34-page statement accusing the United States and Great Britain of having entered upon an openly aggressive course, the final purpose of which is the establishment through force of Anglo-American world domination.

What then should we, the people of the United States, do in our highest interests and in the light of our world-wide responsibility, whether we like this responsibility or not?

The central point of this debate is likely to be the extent to which this country can commit itself to go to war and to the aid of other nations inasmuch as our Constitution provides that Congress alone can declare war.

High government officials have

indicated their desire for widespread discussion on this subject, so tonight we bring you the views of two United States Senators—a Republican and a Democrat—a Labor member of Parliament from Great Britain and a well-known American author and commentator.

Our Government has not yet made known the exact details of the proposed defense pact, so tonight we are exploring the possibilities. We'll hear first from the distinguished Senator and former Governor of Iowa, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Republican, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Senator Hickenlooper. (*Applause.*)

Senator Hickenlooper:

Thank you, Mr. Denny, guests and friends of Town Hall. A North-Atlantic pact should be a vital step toward world security. Its original security arrangement is provided for under Articles 51 and 52 of the United Nations Charter. Its objective is to secure the North-Atlantic nations against aggression and to give them security in re-establishing their moral and economic progress.

The United Nations itself was created for universal collective security. Russia has blocked much of its progress, however, through wholesale use of the veto, but this is one very ominous reason why we and other agreeing nations

should redouble our efforts for security and peace. It seems clear, in view of the fact that Russia has blocked agreement under the United Nations, that these regional pacts offer the best avenue for development of the security and peace which the free nations of the world so earnestly seek.

Several steps have been taken under the United Nations Charter directed toward this end. Mr. Denny has reviewed many of these.

The details of this treaty have not been made public, so final judgment cannot be passed on it until the details are known. These details will have to be submitted to the Senate for careful examination as to our commitments and the mutual commitments of other nations.

It is well understood, however, that this treaty will agree that aggression against one of the nations will be aggression against all. It pledges mutual contribution to the defense plans and the defense forces.

It is definitely a device to combat the scourge of communism in the world, and to protect freedom and free institutions, while the pact pledges mutual assistance, it still cannot commit this country automatically to go to war. Declaration of war is specifically reserved to the Congress by the Constitution, and the Congress in any event would have to be the sole and final authority when the question

arises of whether or not we go to war.

Communism strives to conquer through chaos and economic disaster, but running through all of its plans is the fundamental principle that it will use war if necessary in its march toward world dominion. Our first efforts and without doubt our greatest efforts should be directed toward the rebuilding of economic self-support and moral self-respect of the freedom-loving nations of the world. But those nations, and we ourselves, cannot feel secure in the pursuits of peace unless we have the combined vigorous defense mechanisms to protect and assure us against the threat or the shadow which a designing aggressor would otherwise cast over a peaceful world.

Aggressors never start wars except against weaker nations. In the two world wars of this generation, our coordinated strength with our allies was not accomplished until defeat almost overtook them.

In each instance, it is possible that had these peace-loving nations united their strength as vigorously in peace as they eventually did in the depression of war, the wars might never have been started.

I believe that an ounce of coordination for peace is worth many pounds of so-called cure by war. Aggressors can gobble up small nations piecemeal, but they will

hesitate to attack the moral and physical strength that can come from a sincere union for defense and for economic recovery that free peoples can and I believe must establish. I believe that the North Atlantic pact holds great encouragement to this end. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Hickenlooper. Now we're to hear the views of a Democratic Senator from the State of Tennessee, who has previously served for nearly 10 years as a member of the House of Representatives where he was particularly active in the passage of the legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—Senator Estes Kefauver, of Memphis, Tennessee. Senator Kefauver. (*Applause.*)

Senator Kefauver:

Senator Hickenlooper has very persuasively and accurately stated the position of the Democratic Administration in connection with this proposed North-Atlantic alliance. I think that's pretty good, coming from a Republican from Iowa. (*Laughter and applause.*) But seriously, Senator Hickenlooper is a statesman of a high order. I am very happy that we do not have any partisan politics in connection with our foreign affairs.

I want to make it very clear in the beginning that I favor strongly the closest kind of co-operation between Canada and the

United States on the one hand and the democracies of Western Europe on the other.

The lessons of history show most conclusively that if we are to have stability and peace it is absolutely necessary that the North Atlantic democracies join to work together. This unity was necessary 30 years ago. It is more imperative now, since we are living in an age of atomic energy, supersonic planes, and guided missiles.

After each war starts, there is a combining of military staffs, a lend-lease of munitions and materials, a currency stabilization, removing of trade barriers, and other agreements which enable the democracies to fight aggression more effectively.

The question is, "Why don't we do these things before the outbreak of hostilities?" If we did them before, I have an idea that some way would be found to settle the disagreements which lead to war. Certainly any dictator who has an idea of world conquest would hesitate, stop, look, and listen before these insurmountable forces.

What, then, is the best method of arriving at an arrangement between the North-Atlantic democracies for peace and security?

Senator Hickenlooper has given me a good general description of the North Atlantic alliance, which very soon is going to be submitted to the United States Senate. Even if this is the only solution

presented, I expect to vote for it, Senator Hickenlooper, because I feel it will do some good. It will, at least, be a warning to the Kremlin. Also, it should lead to a closer federation, which is the goal that I see.

Our experience with alliances has not been good in the past. The League of Nations was an alliance based on treaties. It failed because treaties are nothing more than promises, and if one member of an alliance doesn't want to fulfill its obligation, there is nothing that can be done about it.

France and Britain, in the Locarno Pact, agreed to protect the Rhineland. But the British were reluctant about carrying out their agreement, and Hitler marched in unmolested, because the democracies were not unified to meet aggression.

Many examples of the weakness of military alliances are found in history. Military alliances contemplate stopping armies marching across boundary lines. I imagine that Quincy Howe is going to have more to say on that subject.

The Soviets may have other kinds of conquest in mind. Remember the Maginot Line? Remember Czechoslovakia?

Furthermore, it must be recognized that a real agreement for peace and security involves economic matters. A common unity of foreign policies, stabilization of currency, freer trade, as well as a

general military staff, where the military units of each nation become one armed force. These are not fully possible under a military alliance.

I believe you will agree, Mr. Mackay, that the people of western Europe would place more hope in a federation than in an alliance. All these objections are met by a federation if only for limited purposes of the nations involved.

I have in mind the idea so well put forward by Clarence Streit and implemented by Mr. Justice Owen J. Roberts and other distinguished citizens.

We have enthusiastically received the announcement of the federation of five nations of Western Europe. A meeting of representatives of these nations and the United States and Canada, looking toward an agreement of this nature would be an infinitely stronger bulwark against war than any kind of an alliance we could get up.

During these meetings, certainly no nation would dare to attack any of those represented. The possibility of a limited federation at this time, pending a closer unity, should be explored in every way possible. Frankly, I don't see much hope that the President or our State Department will make such a recommendation.

Therefore, as a part of the North Atlantic alliance plan, a meeting should be called now to consummate a federation to be

substituted for the alliance in the future. This, in my opinion, is the surest means of unifying the free peoples of the North Atlantic for military and economic purposes, insuring a period of peace and stability which the world so badly needs today. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Kefauver. Our next speaker should really have come from Missouri, for he's very skeptical of all plans. However, he was born in Boston, attended school in New England, and was graduated from Harvard University, as some of you will be able to detect, although he's lived in New York since 1935. Quincy Howe is not only the author of several books on the field of foreign affairs, but he's one of the best-known radio commentators and a frequent participant in America's Town Meeting of the Air. Welcome back to Town Meeting, Quincy Howe. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Howe:

Well, you're right, Senator Kefauver, I am going to argue that this proposed defense pact with Western Europe rests on a dangerous foundation. It assumes that the United States can prevent another world war by adopting the kind of policy that might have prevented the last one.

It assumes that Communist Russia is committed to the same plans of military conquest that Nazi Germany followed.

It mistakes the world of 1949 for the world of 1939. Of course, the Russian Communists have world-wide ambitions; so did the German Nazis. But the Nazis based their strategy on military conquest. The Communists base theirs on chaos and revolution.

Of course, the United States has an interest in keeping Western Europe safe for democracy. We also have the necessary power—if we use it wisely.

The Soviet leaders depend on mass discontent and Communist fifth columns to further their world-wide cause. These are their weapons of aggression, and they've shown the world in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in Poland, how they use them. Against such methods, military alliances offer little, if any, protection. The chief defensive strength of the Soviet Union lies in its vast spaces and great resources. Against these two, a military alliance with Western Europe is of very little avail.

As for us to use our atomic weapons for any but defensive purposes—that would be to renounce all claim to moral leadership.

Any defense pact we sign with Western Europe must be subordinate to a larger strategy that does not rely primarily on military force. Our present strategy, unfortunately, puts more and more emphasis on preparations for war. We spend almost ten times as much money preparing ourselves

and other countries for war as we spend on foreign relief, reconstruction, and recovery. These figures should be reserved. (*Applause.*)

But, no, our policy makers seem to assume that an irrepressible, inevitable Soviet-American conflict lies somewhere in the future—maybe the near future. They assume that the outcome of this conflict will be determined by armed force. They hope, of course, that the Soviet leaders will capitulate before war comes. But they continue to think, to plan, to prepare for ultimate war, all of which is supposed to win us support and friendship in Western Europe.

I shall be interested to hear what Mr. Mackay, a labor member of the British Parliament, has to say on this matter.

President Conant of Harvard has wisely pointed out that we must make up our minds to live for some time in a divided world—a world that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union can dominate. An early Soviet-American agreement seems, to me, out of the question.

We must either agree to disagree for a long cooling-off period of perhaps two, perhaps five, perhaps ten years, or else prepare for a war that will annihilate both countries and complete the ruin of Western Europe.

Senator Kefauver's bold plea for world federation charts the course

we must eventually take. But how do we get from here to there.

We must recognize, with Senator Hickenlooper, that we live in a world that is still divided into zones of influence, regions of security—call them what you please—that the immediate need is for Western Europe to federate in order to carry real weight in its own right, that the United States can best help this process along by economic aid, that all this war talk, all these war preparations, all this war psychology and propaganda lead to the very disaster that we all want, at all costs, to avoid. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Quincy Howe. We are very fortunate in having with us tonight a prominent member of the British Labor Party, a member of Parliament, who, for the past fifteen years, has devoted his life to the advancement of the idea of a United States of Europe. He's a native of Australia who came to Britain in 1934, has been active in world affairs, and has written several books, his latest being *You Can't Turn the Clock Back*, which was published recently both here and in London. The Honorable R. W. G. Mackay. Mr. Mackay. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Mackay:

We in our country are so indebted to the people of the United States for their great generosity during the last few years, that

I must express at the outset, if I may, what an honor it is for a Socialist member of Parliament to be associated tonight with Mr. Quincy Howe, and with the two Senators from Iowa and Tennessee, who in their different ways and with different conviction have been explaining to you how the bipartisan policy of the United States operates, particularly in regard to the Atlantic Pact.

If I may say so, I want to say this: that every bit of cooperation that we can get between the United States and Western Europe is all to the good. But having said that, surely there are some things that we ought to consider in relation to this enormous step that we're being asked to take now. I want to suggest three, shortly, for your consideration:

The first is that, while the Senator from Iowa has pointed out that the pact is to come within the United Nations Charter, Section 51, we must really face the fact that if it's not a failure of the United Nations, at least we are now getting to the position in which we must understand that this pact must be implemented or that the United Nations Charter is unable to provide the defense mechanism that it was hoped it would provide.

The Three Power unity is broken down. In other words, instead of the United Nations Charter, we are now having an Atlantic Charter of France and Britain and

America and Holland and Belgium and some other European countries, to the exclusion of a great number of the major countries of the world. That, if it doesn't suggest the failure of the United Nations, does make us realize that what matters in this world is power, and that it is power-politics we are going back to if we have a charter or other pact of this kind.

The second point I want to make is important and has been emphasized already by Mr. Quincy Howe. It's important in this sense—as Bing Crosby is eternally saying over your radio and ours, I understand—that we must always “accentuate the positive.” And that's what's important in this matter—we must accentuate the positive.

The Maginot Line mentality that makes people think you can get behind a defense pact and have freedom and the other things that way, completely overlooks the most important factor which is, that if you're going to get defense in this world or if you're going to get freedom in this world, it is going to come because you are providing a decent standard of living for the people of Europe and of the other parts of the world as well. (*Applause.*)

We must concentrate, therefore, as you are in the Marshall Recovery Program, in giving aid to Europe. We must concentrate on building up a strong Europe. We don't have Communists in Great

Britain—God forbid! (*laughter*)—though I'm told you have them over here. (*Laughter.*)

But in Europe you needn't have them if you'd only provide a decent standard of living for people. That means much more than the implementation of the Marshall program. It means creating a free barrier for trade, getting rid of currencies, really establishing, in Western Europe, a proper economic area in which there can be stability and strength and economic production and wealth and things of that kind.

The third point I want to put is this: that we must face the problem, and the Senator from Tennessee—Senator Kefauver—made this point, I thought, so clear, that what we want is not alliance, but government. Government is the alternative to war. The way to hell, we're told, is paved with good intentions. The way to the last World War was paved by defense pacts. Go through them all. We've heard some of them mentioned here tonight. I might mention the Kellogg Pact, to say nothing of the Polish Pact with Britain, none of which stopped the second World War, and none of which were necessary if the League of Nations Charter or the United Nations Charter was an effective instrument. Of course, they are not effective instruments because they are not governments, that's why!

What we want is a federation. I suggest, in the first place, a

federation of Western Europe. If we could create a political union of Western Europe, a political union of Western Europe which would get rid of the barriers that exist today, instead of having 17 armies and 17 navies and 17 air forces, you would have one army and one navy and one air force, taken from 275 million people which is an area, which is a market, which is a big piece of country in a large territory with great resources, as great as those of the United States. (*Applause.*)

If we tried to build a political union of that type, if we in our country gave up power, if we gave up our rights to defense, if we gave up our right to the armies and navies, if we gave up our right to currencies and customs and got a common currency for Europe, and the type of federation that you have in the United States, then an alliance between a United States of Western Europe and a United States of America would provide peace, because it would be so strong and powerful—peace, not only for my lifetime, but for this generation and this century and further afterwards. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Mackay. Well, it's too bad we can't be sure that this program is going to be heard throughout the prospective United States of Europe, Mr. Mackay, because there's not much we here

in the United States can do about that plan unless we can have our voices heard over there.

However, now we've come to a point where we want to have a discussion among our speakers before we take the questions from this very interested Town Hall audience. Senator Hickenlooper, it's our custom to start with the speaker who spoke first. Do you have a comment or question on tonight's discussion?

Senator Hickenlooper: Well, Mr. Denny, I have a comment and a question, I want to comment on

Senator Kefauver's statement about the Republicans adopting the Democratic program at this moment.

Mr. Denny: I thought that would draw fire.

Senator Hickenlooper: I want to remind the very able Senator that the 80th Congress, under Republican control, adopted the Western Hemisphere Pact, that the 80th Congress, under Republican control, adopted the Vandenberg resolution under which we're operating now in this program. So if it's a Democrat program the Democrats are "Johnny-come-latelies"

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

ESTES KEFAUVER—Elected to the Senate from Tennessee last November, Estes Kefauver has been Democratic Representative to Congress since 1939. Born in Madisonville, Tennessee, in 1903, he has an A.B. degree from the University of Tennessee and an LL.B. from Yale. He engaged in the practice of law in Chattanooga from 1926 until 1939. That year, from January until May, he was Commissioner of Finance and Taxation for the State of Tennessee.

In September, 1939, at a special election, he was elected to the 6th Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Sam D. McReynolds. In the Senate, he is a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Senator Kefauver is vice-president of the American Political Science Association. In 1937, he received the "Most Outstanding Young Citizen" award from the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

QUINCY HOWE—Mr Howe, a radio news commentator since 1939, is now also seen on television. Born in Boston in 1900, he received his A.B. degree from Harvard in 1921. The following year he was a student at Christ's College, in Cambridge, England. From 1922 to 1928, he was with the Atlantic Monthly Company; from 1929 to 1935, he was editor of *Living Age*; and since 1935, he has been associated with Simon and Schuster, Inc.

In 1939, Mr. Howe became a news commentator on Station WORX in New York, and in 1942 joined CBS. Mr. Howe is the author of *World Diary* (1929-34), *England Expects Every Man To Do His Duty* (1937), *Blood Is Cheaper Than Water* (1939), and *The News and How To Understand It* (1940). His latest book, *The World Since 1900*, will be published next fall.

BOURKE BLAKEMORE HICKENLOOPER—Senator Hickenlooper, a Republican Senator from Iowa, is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Republican Policy Committee. He was formerly chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee.

Born in Blockton, Iowa, in 1896, Senator Hickenlooper has a B.S. degree from Iowa State College, a J.D. from University of Iowa, and LL.D. degrees from Parsons College and Loras College. Engaging in the practice of law in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, he was a member of the Iowa House of Representatives from 1935 to 1939. From 1939 to 1943 he was Lieutenant Governor of Iowa and, in 1943-44, Governor. He has been a Senator since 1945.

R. W. G. MACKAY—The Honorable R. W. G. Mackay is British Labor Member of Parliament for Northwest Hull. He is the author of *You Can't Turn the Clock Back* and is organizer of a Federal Europe movement in Britain.

on this new theory in world operation. (*Laughter and applause.*) Now I have a question.

Senator Kefauver: First, may I retort by saying that I think the Republican 80th Congress really did pretty well on foreign matters, but I'm not speaking so much about them on domestic issues. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Senator Hickenlooper: Well, I might say, before the election we were accused of not doing very well; after the election, people are beginning to realize that we did a pretty good job after all. (*Applause.*)

Now I would like to ask Mr. Quincy Howe this question. He has said that economic rehabilitation, raising the morals and the economy of the people of Europe is our first objective. I think I referred to that in my remarks, and I believe in that. But as I recall it, the coups in Czechoslovakia, in the Balkans, behind the Iron Curtain were accomplished by Russia in the presence of hundreds of thousands of the Red Army troops and I'm asking Mr. Howe if he expects a magical fire from heaven to come down and destroy the enemy troops if we abandon our strength defense and go entirely upon faith and economic programs. Don't we have to have the military strength to back up the altruistic and humanitarian programs that we're so ably implementing in Europe today with economic re-

covery and our other contributions? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator. Mr. Quincy Howe. Will you step up?

Mr. Howe: Senator Hickenlooper, of course we need both. It's a question of how much of each. I think there is too much emphasis on the military, and not enough on the economic. I think also that history and the record will show that the recent seizures of power by the Communists, in Czechoslovakia particularly, were not achieved by the strength of the Red Army.

I think that the thing that we need to fear in respect to Western Europe is that if something like that should happen in France it would happen because the Communists in France were able to take power through discontent inside France that can be best stopped by aid from this country, not by Russian troops marching into France—Russian troops that we wouldn't be able to stop. (*Applause.*)

Senator Hickenlooper: May I comment on that statement just a moment. About a year ago, I was behind the Iron Curtain in the Balkans, and I assure you that the force of communistic coups in those countries were accomplished, to my personal observation, because of the menace of the Red troops actually on the ground behind the Iron Curtain and for no other reason. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Mackay.

Mr. Mackay: I would like to ask Senator Kefauver a question in regard to the general perception of Europe and Marshall aid. No one is suggesting for a moment that it is right or proper that the United States should interfere or interfere with the European states. But I'd like to get clear as to whether in the minds of the American people it wasn't implied in the whole Marshall recovery program that Europe would ultimately see to it that before the program ended there was some kind of union created in the west of Europe.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Kefauver.

Senator Kefauver: I'll say in answer to that question, Mr. Mackay, that it was certainly understood by the American people and by the Congress when passed the Marshall Plan that there would be some kind of joining together and breaking down of trade barriers and custom barriers, as the part of European nations receiving Marshall aid so that there would be created a big community.

The point I think that a lot of people overlook is the fact that we are doing something—supplying money and sending over supplies, all of which I approve of to try to help the nations of Western Europe, and now by guaranteeing their frontiers—a whole lot more than we would have to do by hav-

ing a kind of federation that I've been talking about, which would be a real guarantee, a real something to enable the nations of Western Europe and the United States to work together.

We know that alliances have never done it in the past, at least not the United States. America, who are furnishing all supplies and the materials in doing most of the guaranteeing, have some hard on the money policy and the economic conditions that go on in these nations of Europe. I don't think that we can ever really look for the kind of peace and stability that we are getting. (Applauds.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Kefauver. Mr. Howe has a question now.

Mr. Howe: I have a question for Senator Kefauver. As a now elected Democratic Senator of Tennessee, would they be known as anything other than the now elected Democratic Senators that would have come to the Senate and have an equal representation together and opposing?

Senator Kefauver: Well, all things are possible. I was hoping for the common and something of an old-fashioned.

Mr. Denny: Senator Kefauver, getting on a great amount of people here. You're not going to read the whole thing are you, Senator? (Laughs.)

Senator Kefauver: No, I'm not.

going to read the first three pages.
(*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: All right, if you can do that in sixty seconds.

Senator Kefauver: Well, there isn't any doubt that President Truman, and our State Department would really like to have this kind of federation if only they thought they could get it over. In June, 1945, President Truman, in making a speech at the University of Kansas, had this to say:

"It will be just as easy for nations to go along in a republic of the world as it is for you to get along in the Republic of the United States. Now, when, in Kansas and Colorado, we have a quarrel over the water in the Arkansas River, they don't call out the National Guard in each state and go to war over it. They bring a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States and abide by that decision. There isn't any reason in the world why we cannot do that internationally."

That, I'm glad to say, is the attitude of President Truman on the matter I've just been talking about. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator. Senator Hickenlooper has another question.

Senator Hickenlooper: Mr. Denny, I'd like to ask Mr. Mackay, the Socialist member of Parliament in Great Britain, this question. The question of European federation, which I think or I should say I hope will eventually be accom-

plished, is one that we've been discussing and it has received a lot of attention. I'd like Mr. Mackay, as a British member of Parliament, to tell us whether he believes this country of ours should go in and coerce, if you please, the European nations into forming a federation under a national government, such as our 48 states have under the Government in Washington, or just how he would like to see that accomplished, or how he thinks it can be accomplished. I think it would be helpful.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Mackay, the microphone is yours.

Mr. Mackay: Well, of course, this is where I completely put my foot in it, but as my plane goes tomorrow, it is pretty safe. (*Laughter.*) The answer to this question is obviously no country is going to coerce any country, and I know no one here would suggest that be done, but on the other hand, we are vitally interested, you and us—us in Europe; you over here—in the problem of creating power and in creating a strong democracy which is going to defend our children against attacks that we fear from communism and things of that kind.

You, in order to achieve this, are already making great grants of money to Western Europe, knowing quite well that this money will be wasted, or may be wasted, unless some kind of political union is created in Europe. You've

given it for one year; you'll probably be giving it for another.

I think, if I were an American citizen, I would be quite entitled to ask myself the question, "When are these Europeans going to unite, and can't we do something to prod them and to tell them that they ought to unite?" It seems to me that without doing anything wrong in the diplomatic field, your new Secretary of State might well say to the governments of Western Europe, and particularly to Britain, which is a little slow in this matter from time to time (*laughter and applause*)—the British always are slow but they stay there in the finish (*applause*)—you might just say to them, "Look, we do want to do something here, and why don't you give a lead in Europe? Why don't you give a lead to bring this about?"

I think the relationships between us are sufficient now, and our understanding and friendship adequate, for you to do quite a bit of prodding in that way. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Mackay. The members of our Town Hall audience here are anxious to ask you all some pertinent questions. Before we turn to those, our listeners will be interested in the following message.

Announcer: America's Town Meeting of the Air is coming to

you tonight from Town Hall in New York City. Questions from the audience will follow in a moment. You can obtain a copy of the Town Meeting Bulletin, containing a complete transcript of tonight's program, by writing to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, enclosing ten cents. Allow at least two weeks for delivery. One dollar will bring you the Bulletin of tonight's program and the ten succeeding issues. The yearly subscription rate is \$4.50.

Most broadcasts of America's Town Meeting between now and April will originate from world famous Town Hall just off Times Square in New York. If you are planning a visit to New York in the near future, won't you be our guests some Tuesday evening? We suggest that you obtain your tickets at least one week in advance either by writing us or coming to our offices at 123 West 43rd Street. The tickets are free—and if you do write, please enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope. We'll be happy to mail the tickets to your New York address if you so desire. If you've never witnessed a broadcast of Town Meeting, put Town Hall on your "must" list when you visit New York.

Now for our question period we return you to Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now are we ready for the questions here in our Town Hall. We'll ask the young man over on the right of the hall.

Man: I should like to ask Senator Hickenlooper a question. If a member of the North Atlantic alliance is drawn into a so-called defensive colonial war, will we be obligated to help? I have in mind Mr. Bevin's machinations in the Middle East and the Dutch military venture in the East Indies. (*Applause.*)

Senator Hickenlooper: I haven't seen and no one publicly has seen the terms of the proposed treaty. I can't tell what its specific provisions would be. In my judgment, I'll say to you that, in that case, the United States would not be required to be drawn into the conflagration because it would not be an act of aggression from outside against a treaty nation.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over here.

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Mackay. Do I understand by your remarks—very favorable in favor of U. S. support in Europe—that the United States should continue that support indefinitely or permanently? If not, how do you think Europe will eventually support herself and not need that aid?

Mr. Mackay: I think the answer is that Europe, with the exception of cotton and oil and one or

two other raw materials, has greater raw materials than the United States of America. Before the war, Italy and France each produced more wheat than Canada; they don't do it today. If you could get a federation of Europe, so as to get a big demand and a big market in Europe, you would begin to develop enormously the food resources of Europe.

The Danes produce, each one, about enough food for eight or ten people in Denmark, but the French and Italians don't, nor do the British. Therefore, my answer to your question is that Europe was once self-sufficient. It can be, as far as any country can be, self-sufficient again. But if we got a federation by the end of this year, and started to develop the economic resources of Europe properly, and organized their economy properly for the whole area of that big people, then we would have sufficient resources to be able to balance our external payments in two of three years and provide the people with the standard of living they require. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the young man with the nice-looking checkered tie, there.

Man: Mr. Howe, I would like to ask you a question. Do you believe that President Truman's proposed development of backward areas offers the type of

economic cooperation you suggest, and do you believe that this could be executed by the United States?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Howe. That's a double-barreled question.

Mr. Howe: I think the answer to both questions is "Yes." (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. There's a good radio man. The gentleman on the aisle over here.

Man: Senator Kefauver, which do you think will receive a Congressional okay in this possible pact we're discussing: an alliance made of promises, or a federation made of commitments?

Senator Kefauver: Undoubtedly, I think the alliance is going to receive the sanction of the Senate. I think we've already built up to it. I think that's what the Vandenberg resolution of last year contemplated, and I think that some commitments may have been made by our State Department for that purpose. So, I think an alliance will pass the Senate by the necessary two-thirds majority.

I do hope that in connection with it that a meeting may be called, or a convention, to explore further possibilities, perhaps, of a federation to take the place of the alliance later on.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, now here's a young man who looks like he stepped right out of the cast of "Life With Father"—a young red head. All right, young man, what's your question?

Man: My question is addressed to Mr. Howe. What terms of disarmament do you think should be included in the pact? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Howe? How old are you, son?

Man: 13 years old.

Mr. Denny: I thought so. That comes from a 13-year-old boy.

Mr. Howe: I wish my 14-year-old boy could ask such small questions. (*Laughter.*) The only answer I can give you, son (I suppose I should call you so) since you have been compared to a character in "Life With Father"—the only answer I can give you is that this is a defense pact which calls for more spending than is now going forward. You say, how would it require disarmament? This pact would mean spending more, not spending less. The burden of my argument is we don't know yet what the pact is going to call for—just how much money. The burden of my argument is that we are spending too large a proportion of our national income on war preparations, whether that is on the defense pact for Western Europe or our own defenses here, and not enough on the direct economic aid to the foreign countries that need it.

Since we don't know the facts, the figures in the defense pact I'm not able to say how much. I would suggest cutting those figures, but since it is going to call for some extra expenditure

I'm afraid it would hardly be a defense pact if it called for a lessening of expenditures by the countries concerned. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Interesting idea though, son. The gentleman on the aisle here.

Man: Will not a mere committal to a European pact render that pact as weak as the committal itself? Shouldn't an active participation in an economic pact be established instead?

Senator Hickenlooper: Well, to the first part of your question, of course, the committal to the pact is just as strong as the honor of the commitment, and it's just as weak. The commitment carries a commitment. Now, as to the commitment to an economic pact, we have that commitment now in Europe relief, or European reconstruction—the economic program we have there. We're going the economic route with great amounts of money.

This North Atlantic pact now proposes to implement the economic recovery of Western Europe with the assurance and the strength against aggression, from other sources in order that their economy can develop and can make them strong and self-governing.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over on the other aisle. Yes?

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Mackay. When the United World Federalist government will come to pass, will that eliminate a

defense pact with Western Europe and bring peace for all the people in this troublesome world?

Mr. Mackay: The answer to that question is "Yes, but so will the millenium." You must face this fact. Of course, world government is an alternative to war and will bring peace, but you'll only get government by extending the area of government over areas where it doesn't exist at the present time.

You don't fight one another in this continent in the 20th century. We do in Europe, and they do in Asia. The problem is to get government into those areas. If you could get continental government in Russia as you've got; in Europe as you could get this year or next; in America as you've got; in China and India, then out of that you could get world government. But do realize the practical steps of extending the area by federation in those areas of the world where it lacks today. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young man under the balcony with the sweater.

Man: I direct my question to Mr. Howe. Do you advocate an American position similar to the one held by the United States during the era of Pearl Harbor, when you suggest that we should not arm to prepare for peace?

Mr. Howe: I think the world changes; it isn't the same now as it was before Pearl Harbor. I think

that at the present time, any war would be a disaster to all concerned. I think the danger of war is of an entirely different order in an atomic age from what it was in the world of ten years ago.

In the world of ten years ago, it was possible and it did happen that a number of countries were able to keep out of the last world war. I think it is going to be utterly impossible for any country, least of all the United States, to keep out of a third World War. I think that a third World War would be far more disastrous than the second one, and, therefore, every step should be taken to prevent that now.

I think the way to prevent that third World War is by preventing the spread of chaos and hunger and misery that breeds war. I think that that is a different situation than you had in the world of ten years ago. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young lady in the blue jacket.

Lady: Don't you think that pitting one part of the world against another would tend to create a war rather than stop one?

Senator Hickenlooper: The pitting has already been done, the issues are drawn. Communism and freedom can't live in the same world together perpetually. (*Applause.*) We, as defenders of the right of individual freedom, must choose whether we band together with other people in the world, to perpetuate self-government and in-

dividual freedom and resist by all peaceful means, if we can, and by force, if we have to, to protect the right of free men to govern themselves. The issue has already been drawn. It's nothing in the speculative future. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman on the aisle there.

Man: Senator Kefauver. Instead of fighting communism through the use of international defense pacts, why not fight it by giving the people something better than communism? (*Applause*)

Senator Kefauver: I would say that giving them democracy and freedom and things that we have in this country is very much better than communism. I have a feeling, sir, that if we can arrange things so that people of Western Europe have an opportunity to have a democracy and a stable economy such as we have, then we're not going to be in any danger of communism in that part of the world.

I agree with you that our great problem, all over the globe, is to give people hope of having freedom, their own right of self-government, and an opportunity to have better lives for themselves and for children, and in that case they won't choose communism.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The man with the blue tie there.

Man: A question for Mr. McKay. Do you think that the United Nations is a step toward or

barrier to your proposed federation of Western Europe?

Mr. Mackay: I don't think the United Nations is either a step towards it or a barrier. It may be a barrier in the sense that it makes people think in terms of the United Nations rather than thinking in terms of a federation. It may be a step towards in a sense that it does bring peoples together so that they can discuss these problems. I think it is just misconceived. The world is not right or ready for the United Nations or for world government yet. We've got to extend it over areas first as I tried to explain before.

When you have an international organization, there's no point in saying goodbye to it. But go on and build up underneath it the political institutions on proper areas of ground which can survive. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over there.

Man: Mr. Howe, please. Might the western alliance work better as a step toward world government if it were set up as a U. N. police force, open to all?

Mr. Howe: I don't think that the U. N. police force idea is so good. I go along very much with Mr. Mackay's theory that you have got to gradually get the world developing into a few large continental regions, and then from that, into a world federation.

The chief merit and benefit of

the United Nations at the present time, I believe, is first as a clearing house and a place for people of different countries to meet and get the habit of consulting together, and second, to do practical things in the world in the field of world health, resources, and that sort of thing.

The police power, I'm afraid, is trying to do the most difficult thing first. I think that's going to have to come last, after you get your world federation. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Howe. I wish there was time to take more of these interesting questions that are ready among the audience here, but while our speakers prepare their summaries of the question, here's a special message of interest to you.

Announcer: After each Town Meeting and Town Hall lecture, someone nearly always approaches our moderator, Mr. Denny, with the question "But what can I do about this?" To answer this question Mr. Denny has prepared a brief, twelve-point pamphlet which tells you simply and practically what you can do to be an active citizen in this democracy and how you can help this nation meet its responsibilities to the world.

Recently we received a request from a national organization for prices on large quantities of this pamphlet. In case there are others of like mind, we want you to know

that this pamphlet is available at considerably reduced cost in larger quantities. For instance, for orders of 1,000 or more the cost is only 5½ cents a copy. For single copies, the price is 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. If you would like a single copy or information about larger quantities, ask for Mr. Denny's pamphlet, *What Can You Do?* and send your request to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Our first summary tonight comes from Mr. Mackay.

Mr. Mackay: Our discussion tonight has shown that there is a fundamental problem which we've got to face. It is that to get peace, you've got to have government, and you only have a government that's any use when it has power. And that you must have strength and power in order to preserve liberty and freedom under government in the different areas of the world. Lincoln told you that many years ago. Why should I come from Britain to have to tell it to you again. (*Laughter.*) That is the whole issue.

Now, in Europe today, we are developing an economic recovery program which is the economic aspect of European organization. We are doing the same with a Council of Europe that is to be called soon, and we're doing the same now with some kind of

Atlantic pact. These three things together can lead to a government in Europe and that will bring ultimately a government of the world. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now Quincy Howe.

Mr. Howe: Combine the realism of Senator Hickenlooper, the idealism of Senator Kefauver, the good sense of Mr. Mackay, and you have the main essentials of an effective American policy toward Western Europe. But let us not permit fear of communism, suspicion of Russia, or war-talk and war-propaganda to let us lose the peace. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Howe. Such unanimity among Town Hall speakers is most unusual. Senator Kefauver.

Senator Kefauver: Let's not wait until another Pearl Harbor before we join forces. Let's take the initiative now by calling a conference to form a federation of North Atlantic democracies. This will give us more protection than any alliance. Like an alliance, a federation requires giving up some sovereignty. There's no difference between them in that respect. But holding onto every straw of sovereignty, while paying 75 cents out of every \$1 for war and living in danger of atomic destruction just doesn't make sense. Sovereignty belongs to the people, and if they want to transfer some of it to a stronger body, it means

more liberty and security for all of us. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Kefauver. And now a final word from Senator Hickenlooper.

Senator Hickenlooper: I think in summary, ladies and gentlemen, I might say that our objectives, I believe, are all for peace, we're united on that. I recall that when this wilderness of America was broken by pioneers who came here seeking peace and opportunity, they went to worship their God on Sunday to increase their moral convictions, but they carried their guns and their muskets and kept their powder dry to protect them in the advancement of those morals.

I might say to you that if peace is the objective in this world, and freedom and humanity, then I believe we should work toward that end, and spend toward that end, but we should keep our powder dry to see that those who are of that moral suasion are protected in the advancement of humanity. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Hickenlooper, Senator Kefauver, Mr. Howe and Mr. Mackay. Next week we continue our discussion of tonight's situation with the subject, "Do We Need a New

Approach to Peace?" Our speakers will be Dorothy Thompson, author and syndicate columnist; Cord Meyer, Jr., president of the United World Federalists; Richard Lauterbach, author and former foreign correspondent; and David Owen, Assistant Secretary General for economic affairs of the United Nations.

Two weeks from tonight, February 15, our subject is on a closely related topic, "Is There Any Defense Against Atomic Warfare?" Members of our panel will be outstanding authorities; Senator Brian McMahon, Democrat of Connecticut, and Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy; Major General Leslie R. Groves, Retired, who directed the Manhattan Atomic Bomb Project; Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner; and David Bradley, author of the new book, *No Place To Hide*, which by the way is reprinted in part in the February issue of *The Reader's Digest*.

Let me remind you that you may obtain a copy of tonight's broadcast by sending ten cents to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y. Plan now to be with us next Tuesday and every Tuesday at the sound of the crier's bell.

Concerning Town Hall

WHEN NEXT YOU COME TO NEW YORK
. VISIT FAMOUS TOWN HALL



This internationally-known sign hangs in front of one of the landmarks of New York—a handsome Georgian-style building designed by the great architectural firm of McKim, Mead and White. Half a block from Times Square, head of the theatre district, Town Hall is within walking distance of most leading hotels and shops. All subways are near and taxi-drivers need only to be told, "Town Hall!"



AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING—now regularly on Television (as well as Radio)—originates from Town Hall on Tuesday nights throughout the winter season. (During the sunny half of the year as many of you know, it travels the length and breadth of the United States.) Tickets to Broadcast-Telecasts are free. Stop in or, better still, write in advance.



MUSIC—More musical events are held annually in Town Hall than in any other concert hall in the world. Such musical greats as Lotte Lehmann, Yehudi and Hepzibah Menuhin, Marian Anderson, Aksel Schiotz and Nelson Eddy have made their American recital debut here. When planning a trip to New York write for the monthly Calendar of Events.



LECTURES—Town Hall's world-famous Morning Lectures, now in their 55th season, run from November through April. Leaders of thought and opinion are heard Mondays, Wednesdays and Saturdays at 11. Although sold by subscription months in advance, a few single admissions are almost always available.

FOR INFORMATION IN CONNECTION WITH YOUR VISIT TO NEW YORK, WRITE: PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR, TOWN HALL, NEW YORK 18, N. Y. LUXemburg 2-2424.
